

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended as indicated hereinabove.

Claims 1-11 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fogg (U.S. Patent 6,466,624 B1) in view of Nybo et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0052933 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claims 1-11 comprise as elements: determining a respective displacement vector field from a comparison of two successive optically acquired images; identifying a trajectory for each pixel of the optically acquired images from the displacement vector fields; and applying an operation to the images optically acquired by the detector unit along the trajectory.

Nybo teaches capturing video with a video camera and converting video into the MPEG format.

Fogg describes image-enhancement methods for an MPEG stream input.

Fogg cannot be modified to operate on original captured images. Fogg uses the information embedded in the MPEG stream for image enhancement, and Fogg would not be operable if, instead of an MPEG stream, the original captured images were provided on the Fogg's input. See, for example, col. 12, line 63, – col. 13, line 3 of Fogg, cited by the Examiner in the pending Office Action, page 5.

Therefore, Fogg teaches away from the present invention by relying on the input being different from the original captured images, and Claims 1-11 would not read on Fogg modified by Nybo.

Modifying Fogg by Nybo only adds to the Fogg's MPEG processor a camera producing MPEG video. This combination does not allow implementing any of the aforementioned elements operating on optically acquired images in Claims 1-11 because

the Fogg component cannot be modified to operate on originally acquired images and Nybo component only captures video and converts it into MPEG.

As explained hereinabove, the aforementioned elements of Claims 1-11 are not taught or suggested in Fogg, Nybo, or their combination. Therefore, Claims 1-11 are patentable and nonobvious over Fogg and Nybo under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and should be allowed.

Response to Arguments in the Final Office Action

In response to the aforementioned arguments, in the pending Final Office Action, page 2, Examiner had stated the following:

Applicants state that Fogg cannot be modified with Nybo since Fogg uses original captured images which suggest that Nybo does not use original captured images. And such a combination of original images with non-original images is not compatible as suggested by the applicants. The examiner notes that Fogg uses both “directly-supplied (‘raw’) and ... intermediary processed data bitstream elements” in col. 12, lines 59-64. Thus, a combination of Fogg’s teaching of using both raw images also known as original captured images with non-original images also known as intermediary processed data bitstream elements such as MPEG with Nybo’s non-original images is reasonable.

The above is the full Examiner’s response to Applicant’s arguments.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Fogg does not use original captured images, cannot operate on original captured images, and cannot be modified to do so.

In the part quoted by the Examiner, Fogg reads: “bitstream processor 622 preferably operates in the coded domain, analyzing and/or otherwise processing directly-supplied (‘raw’) and/or intermediately processed data bitstream elements to provide metrics for further processing”.

In this quote from Fogg, the “directly-supplied (‘raw’)” data is the MPEG stream and the “intermediately processed data bitstream elements” are parts of MPEG stream processed by the Fogg’s device before being supplied to the Fogg’s bitstream processor.

This quote from Fogg affirms that Fogg requires an MPEG stream input and cannot operate on original captured images.

Fogg modified with Nybo results in Fogg operating on MPEG stream produced by Nybo. Fogg modified with Nybo cannot perform the operations recited in Claims 1-11 on original captured images.

Response to Arguments in the Advisory Office Action

In the pending Advisory Action, Examiner states that “given the broadest reasonable interpretation, Fogg does operate on original captured images as shown upon the output of fig. 4: ‘Bitstream Data’ and ‘Decoded Samples’ which are captured via fig. 4:401 that can be a receiver the intercepts to capture signal transmissions thrown from an unspecified signal source and operated upon via fig. 4:402.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Fogg’s patent is entitled “Video **Decoder** with Bit Stream Based Enhancements”, the first sentence of Fogg’s Abstract is: “An advanced **decoder** provides enhancement processing in accordance with information previously known only to the **decoder** and/or **encoder**.” There is no reasonable interpretation of Fogg where it operates on anything but encoded or decoded images, which means MPEG-compressed and MPEG-decompressed images, as Fogg makes clear throughout.

The Bitstream Data and Decoded Samples on Fogg’s Fig. 4 originate from Decode Subsystem 401 shown on Fig. 4. These data are not original captured images, they do not originate from a capturing device; they are a product of Decode Subsystem processing a MPEG stream. Furthermore, the MPEG stream is not a sequence of original captured images; it is a product of processing, modification, and compression of such images.

Amendments to Claims 1 and 7

To further clarify the scope of the Claims in the present Application, both base Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite that the acquired images are not subjected to compression or decompression prior to the applying of the operation.

Fogg works exclusively with images subjected to compression or decompression, therefore the elements of Claims 1-11 reciting the acquired images are not taught or suggested in Fogg, Nybo, or their combination. Therefore, Claims 1-11 are patentable and nonobvious over Fogg and Nybo under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and should be allowed.

It is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited in this case. Should any questions arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HOUSTON ELISEEVA LLP

By /Maria M. Eliseeva/

Maria M. Eliseeva
Registration No.: 43,328
Tel.: 781 863 9991
Fax: 781 863 9931

4 Militia Drive, Suite 4
Lexington, Massachusetts 02421-4705
Date: February 5, 2009